

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

2025:PHHC:136220



136

CRWP-10588-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 29.09.2025.

Vandna and another

...Petitioners.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

Present: Mr. Prabhjot Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.
Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. Sarvesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate
for respondent Nos.4 to 7.

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioners has stated that inadvertently in the head note of the petition, the age of petitioner No.2 has been inadvertently mentioned as 21 whereas he is of 19 years. This fact is also made out from his Aadhar Card (Annexure P-2) that has been placed on record as per which his DOB is 20.10.2006 and has prayed for making necessary correction in the head note.

As per Annexure P2 placed on record, the DOB of petitioner No.2 is 20.10.2006 and his age comes to 19 years.

Registry is directed to make the necessary correction in the head note.

Prayer in the instant petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of directions to respondent No.2 to decide the representation dated 25.09.2025 (Annexure P-3) by protecting the life and liberty to the petitioners, who are in live-in-relationship against the wishes of private respondents No.4 to 7.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that both the petitioners are major, petitioner No.1 – Vandna, aged 18 years, and petitioner No.2 – Karan, aged 19 years, are in live-in-relationship with each other. The petitioners seek protection to their life and liberty. They apprehend danger from respondents No.4 to 7. Hence, they are seeking protection in that regard and have approached this Court by way of filing the instant petition. The

copies of Aadhaar card of petitioners (Annexures P-1 and P-2) have been placed on record.

Learned counsel for respondent Nos.4 to 7 has also appeared and stated that the private respondents have no objection regarding the relationship of the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has relied upon a judgment of this Court in **CWP No.31834 of 2019** titled as “***Megha and another vs. State of Haryana and others***” decided on 04.11.2019 and submitted that this Court had entertained petition for protection of couples in live-in relationship.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents-State.

At this stage, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case as well as nature of relationship between the petitioners, the petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to look into the representation dated 25.09.2025 (Annexure P-3) at the earliest, regarding threat perception and take necessary steps, if any required, in accordance with law, to ensure that the life and liberty of the petitioners is not jeopardized at the hands of the private respondents. However, this direction will have no effect on any civil or criminal action, which could be initiated in the matter in accordance with law.

(SUKHVNDER KAUR)
JUDGE

29.09.2025

jjyoti3

Whether speaking/reasoned? : Yes/ No
Whether reportable? : Yes/ No